UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,918	10/23/2003	Ryan Beehler	8002AC-88	6512

22150 7590 09/25/2006

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER	
SHIMIZU, MATSUICHIRO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2612	

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/691,918	BEEHLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matsuichiro Shimizu	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-23,25-35,37-40* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,24 and 36* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/23/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the *second* paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-5 recite the limitation "the authentication control module" in line 3 of claim 4 and line 2 of claim 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country,

more than one year

prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 9-15,18,23 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sanders et al. (4,754,255).

Regarding claim 1, Sanders discloses a security system (col. 2, lines 9-14, security system) having a unique security identification (col. 3, lines 21-24, user identification associated with authorized operator and vehicle identification among multiple vehicles) comprising

a wireless control device (col. 2, lines 15-24, keypad/transmitter) for controlling the security system, wherein

the wireless control device transmits a message to the security system comprising

the unique security identification and a function command (col. 3, lines 21-24, vehicle ID and authorized operator; col. Lines 13-22, entry commands)

the wireless control device comprising a **keypad** (col. 2, lines 15-24, keypad/transmitter) **for entering a tag identification** corresponding to the unique security identification (col. 2, lines 9-14, user identification and vehicle identification for usage authorization).

Regarding **claim 9**, Sanders discloses a method for selectively controlling a security system (col. 2, lines 9-14, security system) comprising:

receiving a tag identification (Fig. 3, (col. 3, lines 21-24, , user identification associated with authorized operator and vehicle identification among multiple vehicles);

determining a security identification based on the tag identification (Fig. 3, col. 2, lines 9-14, differentiating received user identification and vehicle identification for usage authorization); and

transmitting a message comprising the security identification and a security system command (col. 13, lines 13-19, open, lock or unlock command associated with authorized user identification).

Regarding **claim 10**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising **comparing** (col. 11, lines 17-23, comparison associated with determination of user identification among multiple of user) the security identification to a stored security identification in the security system.

Regarding **claim 11**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising **executing** (col. 3, lines 21-24, vehicle ID and authorized operator; col. Lines 13-22, entry commands by the authorized operator being identified) the security system command upon determining the security identification to correspond to a stored security identification in the security system.

Regarding **claim 12**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the security identification is **unique** (col. 3, lines 21-24, , user identification associated with authorized operator and vehicle identification among multiple vehicles) to the security system.

Regarding **claim 13**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the security system command controls a lock feature (col. 13, lines 13-19, lock).

Regarding **claim 14**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising broadcasting the message to control at least two security systems (col. 13, lines 4-9, arm or disarm any number of automobiles with one message from one transmitter).

Regarding **claim 15**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising defining functions (col. 2, lines 55-68, master operator in

programming mode defines other access codes for family members) of the security system in a control device.

Regarding **claim 18**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising defining, permanently, a base identification (col. 2, lines 55-68, master operator in programming mode alters the master code associated with a base identification) of a management system in a control device.

Regarding **claim 23**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, wherein a control device has a unique identification (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 21-24, user identification associated with authorized operator and vehicle identification among multiple vehicles).

Regarding **claim 32**, Sanders discloses the method of claim 9, wherein a consumer mode provides at least one of a remote security function, a keyless entry function (col. 1,lines 25-34; col. 13, lines 13-19, remotely unlock the doors).

Regarding **claim 33**, Sanders discloses a security system having a unique security identification comprising

a control device (Fig. 1, keypad/transmitter device 11-18) for controlling the security system, wherein

the control device transmits a message to the security system comprising

the unique security identification and a function command (Fig. 3, col. 2, lines 9-14, differentiating received user identification and vehicle identification for usage authorization with **unique** identification),

the control device comprising means for entering (Fig. 1, keypad 11) a tag identification corresponding to the unique security identification (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 21-24, , user identification associated with authorized operator and vehicle identification among multiple vehicles).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 16-17, 19-22, 25-27, 30-31, 34-35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of Caren (6,870,458).

Regarding **claims 2,19, 25-26 and 34**, Sanders continues to disclose the method of claims 1,9 and 33. But Sanders is silent on defining a permission for transmitting the security system command according to **an authentication control module message.**

However, Caren discloses, in the art of vehicle security system, defining a permission for transmitting the security system command according to an **authentication control module message** (col. 4, lines 13-60, **programming source** 30 associated with **an authentication control module** sends message included in programming signal 28 to remote control device wherein **period** of dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set) for the purpose of providing increased vehicle security.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of Caren just discussed above because such limited operation prevents unauthorized access to vehicle after closing without unnecessarily accessing the vehicle by all person, thus increasing vehicle security.

Regarding **claims 16, 27 and 30**, Sanders continues to disclose the method of claim 9. But Sanders is silent on an authentication control module

selectively sets a permission changing dealership mode to customer mode of the security system wirelessly.

However, Caren discloses, in the art of vehicle security system, **an authentication control module** selectively sets a permission changing dealership mode to customer mode of the security system (col. 4, lines 31-44, dealership mode to customer mode) wirelessly (col. 4, lines 64-67, RF link) for the purpose of providing increased vehicle security.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of Caren just discussed above because such limited operation prevents unauthorized access to vehicle after closing without unnecessarily accessing the vehicle by all person, thus increasing vehicle security.

Regarding **claims 17**, Caren continues to disclose the method of claim 16, wherein a permission for changing the mode (col. 4, lines 31-44, dealership mode to customer mode) is granted by an authentication control module (col. 4, lines 13-60, **programming source** 30 associated with **an authentication control module** sends message included in **programming signal 28** to remote control device wherein **period** of dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set).

Regarding **claim 20**, Sanders continues to disclose the method of claim 9, further comprising defining a base identification of a control device (col. 2, lines 55-68, master operator in programming mode alters the master code

associated with a base identification) according to an authentication control module message.

But Sanders is silent on an authentication control module message.

However, Caren discloses, in the art of vehicle security system, an authentication control module message (col. 4, lines 31-44, message for changing dealership mode to customer mode) for the purpose of providing increased vehicle security.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of Caren just discussed above because such limited operation prevents unauthorized access to vehicle after closing without unnecessarily accessing the vehicle by all person, thus increasing vehicle security.

Regarding **claim 21**, Caren continues to disclose the method of claim 20, wherein the base identification expires after a pre-determined time interval (col. 4, lines 13-60, programming source 30 associated with an authentication control module sends message included in programming signal 28 to remote control device wherein period of dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set).

Regarding **claim 22**, Caren continues to disclose the method of claim 20, wherein the base identification expires (col. 4, lines 13-60, programming source 30 associated with an authentication control module sends message included in programming signal 28 to remote control device wherein period of

dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set) after a time interval that is selectable in an authentication control module.

Regarding claim 31, ~~Caren~~ Sanders continues to disclose the method of claim 9. But ~~Caren~~ Sanders is silent on a dealer mode provides a passive arming function and a test drive function.

However, Caren discloses, in the art of vehicle security system, a dealer mode provides a passive arming function (col. 5, lines 1-15, a security system 20 to passive arm in view of proximity or far from dealer location is one of various changes (col. 5, lines 50-53)) and a test drive function (col. 4, lines 13-23, dealer mode or common signal 16a) for the purpose of providing increased vehicle security.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of Caren just discussed above because such limited operation prevents unauthorized access to vehicle without unnecessarily accessing the vehicle beyond proximity area by all person, thus increasing vehicle security.

Regarding claims 3 and 35, Sanders in view of Caren continues to disclose the security system of claim 2,34, further comprising a database including the operational parameter, wherein the database is accessible by the

authentication control module (Caren-col. 4, lines 13-60, programming source 30 associated with an authentication control module sends message included in programming signal 28 to remote control device wherein period of dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set).

Regarding **claims 5 and 37**, Sanders continues to disclose the vehicle security system of claims 1,33.

But Sanders is silent on the vehicle security system, further comprising an interface (col. 2, lines 45-55, interface associated with keyboard of computer) of the authentication control module.

However, Caren discloses, in the art of vehicle security system, an interface (col. 2, lines 45-55, interface associated with keyboard of computer) of the authentication control module for the purpose of increasing security.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of Caren just discussed above because such security updating prevents unauthorized access to vehicle after dealer closing without unnecessarily accessing the vehicle by all person, thus increasing vehicle security.

Regarding **claims 6 and 38**, Caren continues to disclose the vehicle security system of claim 5,37, wherein the interface is a computer software product (col. 2, lines 45-55, software product or module associated with conversion of keyboard signal to digital signal) stored in a computer coupled to

the authentication control module (col. 4, lines 13-60, portion of programming source 30).

Regarding **claims 7 and 39**, Caren continues to disclose the vehicle security system of claims 2, 34, wherein an authentication control module (col. 4, lines 13-60, programming source 30 associated with an authentication control module sends message included in programming signal 28 to remote control device wherein period of dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set) is wirelessly (col. 4, lines 64-67, RF link) coupled to the control device during a time (col. 4, lines 13-60, period of dealer operation during the day in programming signal 28 is set) for granting the operational parameter to the control device.

Regarding **claims 8 and 40**, Sanders discloses the vehicle security system of claims 2, 34, wherein the tag identification is mixed with a base identification to determine the unique security identification (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 21-24, base identification associated with user identification as authorized operator and vehicle identification among multiple vehicles or tags).

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of Hayes (7,046,161).

Regarding **claim 28**, Sanders continues to disclose the method of claim 9. But Sanders is silent on communicating wirelessly, two-way, between an authentication control module and a control device.

However, **Hayes** discloses, in the art of device security system, communicating wirelessly, two-way, between an authentication control module (Fig. 15, computer 302) and a control device (col. 11, line 59+, two-way RF communication) for the purpose of providing automatic set-up.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of **Hayes** just discussed above because such automatic setting without unnecessarily spending time, thus providing easy set-up.

Regarding **claim 29**, Sanders continues to disclose the method of claim 9. But Sanders is silent on communicating, two-way, between an authentication control module and a control device via a docking station.

However, Hayes discloses, in the art of device security system, communicating wirelessly, two-way, between an authentication control module (Fig. 15, computer 302) and a control device (col. 11, line 59+, two-way communication via docking device 304) via docking device (Fig. 14, remote 10 to docking device 304) for the purpose of providing automatic set-up.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Sanders the features of Hayes just discussed above because such automatic setting via docking device without unnecessarily spending time, thus providing easy set-up.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 24 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding **claims 4 and 36**, the prior arts fail to teach or fairly suggest the wireless control device comprises **a serial number known to a database including the operational parameter, wherein the database is accessible by the authentication control module.**

Regarding **claim 24**, the prior arts fail to teach or fairly suggest an authentication control module selectively allows or denies a control device's access to a base identification.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matsuichiro Shimizu whose telephone number is 571-272-3066. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on 571-272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3068.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-8576).

Matuichiro Shimizu
September 18, 2006

WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600